



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/733,326	12/12/2003	Sladjana Petrovic	38898-0059	9081
23577	7590	05/29/2009	EXAMINER	
RIDOUT & MAYBEE LLP			JOHNSON, CARLTON	
225 KING STREET WEST				
10TH FLOOR			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
TORONTO, ON M5V 3M2			2436	
CANADA				
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/29/2009	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/733,326	PETROVIC, SLADJANA
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	CARLTON V. JOHNSON	2436

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 08 May 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a)  The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

- (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.

6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-4,6-16,18-26,28-34.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.

12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

/Nasser G Moazzami/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2436

/Carlton V. Johnson/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2436

## Response to Arguments

## Examiner Position:

The arguments were not persuasive in overcoming the currently rejected claims.

The Williams prior art discloses the transfer of a timestamp parameter (within the token data structure) between two network-connected systems. (see Williams paragraph [0050], lines 1-5: token may include an optional timestamp)

Furthermore, the Woods prior art discloses the direct transfer of session state parameters such as a session ID parameter and a time/date parameter between network-connected entities. (see Wood paragraph [0050], lines 15-17: some parameters can be passed directly between systems)

Furthermore, the Lennon prior art discloses the transfer of session state including session state information between two network-connected systems. The Lennon prior art clearly discloses the transfer of a session identifier indicating a particular session between the two network-connected systems. (see Lennon col. 54, lines 37-40: transmit a session identifier (directly) from a first device to a second device; col. 54, lines 45-50; col. 56, lines 1-6: redirecting session output from first device to second device; transfer session information (session ID and additional session state information) between two servers)

All references (Williams, Wood, and Lennon) disclose the transfer of session information such as identifiers, time/date information such as timestamps, and session state information between network-connected systems (servers, clients). Clearly, a timestamp is a parameter available for transfer between systems in the management of session information.

Each obviousness combination indicates the claim limitation(s) the combined prior art references teach. In addition, a cited passage from the referenced prior art indicates the motivation for the obviousness combination. Each obviousness combination's disclosure is equivalent to the Applicant's claimed limitation(s) for the claimed invention.

It is not a requirement that the referenced prior art solve the same problem as claimed invention in order to be combinable. There are three criteria for combination: (1) same field of endeavor (which is session management); (2) motivation for the combination (stated in Office Action); and (3) successful disclosure of claim limitation due to prior art combination. All three criteria are satisfied by the Office Action. (see Williams paragraph [0016], lines 1-4; paragraph [0036], lines 1-2; see Woods paragraph [0047], lines 6-14; paragraph [0057], lines 21-24; see Bachman col. 1, lines 65-67: same field of endeavor: session management)

The Williams and Woods prior art combination discloses that if the request must be redirected to a different server where the requested resource is located (see Williams paragraph [0067], lines 12-18: redirection of session token and session information, redirection request for resources) then the decrypted session token is transmitted to the new server (see Wood paragraph [0044], lines 8-14; paragraph [0051], lines 1-3: session token with redirection request) and the session management web service generates a new session token to be used in place of the previous session token. The new session token is transmitted with the requested web resource.